

REMARKS

Claims 13-23 are pending.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

I. The Rejection under 35 USC § 112, First Paragraph

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner issued a rejection under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, on grounds that the specification fails to provide written description of the “modem” in claims 13-16. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

To satisfy the written description requirement, the specification must describe the claimed invention in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art would reasonably conclude that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed. (MPEP § 2163.) Thus, if one skilled in the art would understand that a component was necessarily included in the claimed invention, then the lack of an express disclosure of that component would not serve as proper grounds for a § 112 rejection.

Claim 1 recites a modem coupled to the computer through a Bluetooth connection. Data packets transmitted through this connection are then transmitted to the Internet. From these disclosures, one skilled in the art would clearly understand that, in order to support both Bluetooth and Internet communications, some form of modulation/demodulation is necessarily required, e.g., wireless communications inherently require modulation since the data signal must be combined with a carrier signal in the appropriate frequency band.

In the case of claim 1, one skilled in the art would understand that a modem is necessarily required in order to support the communication of data packets between the computer and Internet. By way of non-limiting example, this modem may include or otherwise correspond to the multi-access system 200 shown in Figure 2. Accordingly, it is submitted that the specification provides a description sufficient to support the recitation of a modem in the claims. Withdrawal of the § 112 rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

II. The Rejection under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 13-23 were rejected for being obvious in view of an Agrawal-Cousins combination. Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites (1) transmitting data packets between a computer and a modem through the Bluetooth connection and (2) that the modem transmits the data packets via an air interface for accessing the Internet. These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references.

The Agrawal patent discloses establishing a Bluetooth connection between a master device and a slave device. However, Agrawal does not disclose that either device is a computer or a modem. Rather, Agrawal merely discloses that data is transmitted between these devices through a Bluetooth connection. Moreover, Agrawal does not teach or suggest that the master device or the slave device transmits the data packets, received from a computer over a Bluetooth connection, to an air interface for accessing the Internet.

To make up for deficiencies of Agrawal, the Cousins publication was cited. But, the Cousins publication only discloses transmitting data between a client and server through a modem. Cousins does not teach or suggest that its modem receives data packets from a computer over a Bluetooth connection. Moreover, Cousins does not teach or suggest transmitting data packets received from a computer over a Bluetooth connection via an air interface for accessing the Internet. The Examiner relied on Paragraph [27] of Cousins for these features. However, Paragraph [27] makes not mention of this air interface or of the Bluetooth connection.

Based on these differences, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13 and its dependent claims are allowable over an Agrawal-Cousins combination.

Claim 18 recites that the multi-access system of the modem “sends the data packets through the plurality of radio communication terminals based on a same destination IP address and a same data link address, said same data link address corresponding to the computer.” Claim 18 further requires, by virtue of claim 16 from which it also depends, that the multi-access system “sends data packets belonging to a same call from the computer for wireless transmission through a plurality of radio communication terminals.” These features are not taught or suggested by the Agrawal and Cousins references.

The Agrawal patent merely discloses transmitting packets between master and slave devices through a Bluetooth connection. And, Cousins discloses transmitting data packets between the Internet and a client via a modem. However, neither reference teaches or suggests

the invention defined in claim 18. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 18 is allowable, not only by virtue of its dependency from claim 13 but also based on the features separately recited therein.

Claim 19 recites “a multi-access routing system for routing data packets from the multimedia system to the radio communication terminals according to a slot assignment method.” The Agrawal patent discloses slots but those slots are not used in the same way as the multi-accessing system of claim 19, e.g., for routing data packets received from a computer through a Bluetooth connection, for transmission to an air interface for the Internet.

Claim 21 recites that the slot assignment method comprises “performing a one-on-one assignment for mapping each of the computer to a respective one of the radio communication terminals; and a common sharing method for allowing each computer to share the plurality of radio communication terminals for transmitting data packets.” These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 22 recites “a plurality of physical data link control circuits provided in one-to-one correspondence with the plurality of computers, each of said physical data link control circuits controlling a corresponding physical data link; a TCP/IP control circuit to perform a TCP/IP protocol function on data packets transmitted from the plurality of physical data link control circuits; a command/response control circuit for performing/responding to a command of the computers transmitted from the TCP/IP control circuit; and a data control circuit for sorting and buffering data transmitted from the TCP/IP control circuit.” These features are not taught

or suggested by the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 23 recites that the the multi-access routing system “sets a slot assignment method according to a command of at least one of the computers, assigns a slot to said one of the computers according to the set slot assignment method, and routes data packets associated with a same call between said one of the computers and multiple ones the radio communication terminals based on said same destination IP address and said same data link address associated with each of the packets.” These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and timely allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Serial No. 10/614,330
Amendment dated October 29, 2007
Reply to Office Action of August 1, 2007

Docket No. P-0486

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Ntiros
Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 766-3777 DYK/SWN/kzw

Date: October 29, 2007

Q:\Documents\2000-555\131549
\\Fk4\Documents\2000\2000-555\131549.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610